

The Dewan drew the attention of the member to the fact that a portion of the arrears of previous years had been realised and a sum of Rs. 7½ lakhs was included in the State Budget as the amount expected to be realised during 1923-24.

Mr. H. Krishna Sastry hoped that this practice of including in the annual Budget the revenue due for each year from the Cantonment authorities would be continued and that in addition the detailed budget estimates of the Assigned Tract would also be placed before the Assembly so that the members might have an idea of the Assigned Tract Surplus Revenue account.

Mr. C. Krishna Murthi urged that this was very desirable.

The Dewan said that a *pro forma* account was compiled every year according to the settlement arrived at in 1912 and that account was being furnished to the Government.

Mr. C. Krishna Murthi again urged the need for giving the Assembly a voice in the matter as it was very necessary that there should be some control over the expenditure met from that revenue to guard against the risk of the surplus vanishing with the growing expenditure of the Station.

A point of order was then raised by the *Dewan*, who pointed out that the subject of the Assigned Tract Revenue was outside the scope of the Assembly's discussion and the attention of the members was again drawn to the Address wherein it was stated that the Government were pressing for a final settlement and that there was reason to expect that the question would be settled soon.

Mr. C. Narasimhaiya said that what the members required was that they should have means of satisfying themselves that the revenue due to the State was correctly calculated in terms of the settlement and was actually paid to them regularly and that they were not, in the least, anxious that they should discuss what was not within their competence, *viz*, the terms of the settlement.

The Dewan again pointed out that the Assembly was not authorised to discuss the Budget Estimates of the Assigned Tract and that, as was already stated, the Government were trying to come to a settlement and expected that this would be done soon.

REVENUE—(Land Revenue).

(Nos. 4 to 13.)

SUBJECT No. 4.

Reservation of the power of suspending village officers to the Deputy Commissioners and of their dismissal to Government.

Messrs. Bale Siddalinga Setty, Yedatore Taluk; Linge Gowda, Mysore Taluk and H. Krishna Sastry, Krishnarajapete Taluk.

Mr. H. Krishna Sastry stated that prior to the year 1908, the power of suspending and dismissing village officers vested only in Government; but at present this power is being exercised by Amildars subject to the approval of Sub-Division Officers, the consequence being that, if a village officer was not in the good books of the Amildar, he was sure to suffer some punishment at his hands. He therefore advocated the desirability of reviving the practice that existed prior to the year 1908.

The Dewan pointed out that Section 7, of the Village Offices Regulation of 1908 was framed after a consideration of all aspects of the case and there was no reason to re-open the question. He liked to know what were the inconveniences caused by the existing orders.

Mr. Siddalinga Setty represented that it was not desirable to invest the Amildars and Assistant Commissioners with powers of suspending and dismissing village officers as they were likely to make use of the powers in the case of such of the village officers as may fail to make proper supplies at the time of their visits to the villages. He suggested that the Deputy Commissioners might be authorised to order suspension of village officers, the power of dismissal remaining with the Government.

The Dewan assured the members that if a single instance of illegal punishment was brought to his notice, he would take suitable notice of the conduct of the officers concerned.

Mr. Rasool Khan said that the present system was quite satisfactory as it was desirable in the interests of efficiency, and that the Amildar who knows the work of the village officers well should have the power of punishing them for slackness in their work.

The Dewan said that there was no need to change the existing rule for the present.

(a) *Mr. T. Ramachandra Rao* urged that the term of grant of *gomal* and other lands for temporary cultivation which was coming to a close might be extended for a further period.

Mr. Vema Reddy argued that cattle were the mainstay of the raiyats and it was very important that a sufficient extent of really good *gomal* land was preserved in each tract for their use and only the excess over and above such land disposed of for cultivation purposes.

Mr. Anantiah Setty also spoke against the proposal to give away *gomal* lands for cultivation and several other members supported him.

The Dewan pointed out that, as it was found on enquiry that the system of granting *gomal* lands for temporary cultivation was not availed of to a large extent, Government had recently ordered that there was no need to extend the system for any further period.

(b) *Mr. T. Ramachandra Rao* urged that the Amrut Mahal Kavals and date groves recently thrown open for cultivation might be given to poor raiyats at upset prices instead of being sold by auction.

Mr. B. Srinivasiengar supported the previous speaker and added that a limit might be fixed in regard to the price up to which lands might be disposed of by various grades of Revenue Officers, such as Amildars, Sub-Division Officers and Deputy Commissioners.

The Dewan wanted to know what the remedy was if an Amildar undervalued the land when selling it for an upset price.

Mr. Karnick Krishnamurthi Rao thought that it would be better if lands were always sold by auction, as otherwise there was the danger of favouritism being shown to particular individuals.

Mr. Vema Reddy suggested that the malki, if any, on the land might be sold by auction separately and the land itself given at an upset price to a different man. But the Dewan thought that that was an impracticable suggestion.

B. R. S.

SUBJECT No. 5.

(a) Continuance of the system of grant of *gomal* and other lands for temporary cultivation.

(b) Grant of Amrut Mahal Kavals and other lands to raiyats for cultivation.

Mr. T. Ramachandra Rao, Magadi Taluk.